A

HLGP
11.7.47

HC

File No. 554 of 1931.

19

Collection No.

Pg 12

Resident's Office,

Bangalore.

Pros. Serial Nos. 1---8

S.N 3 & 5,
Clothing 31
35

Subject.

Revision of the pay of the Police Force in the Civil & Military Station of Bangalore.

Previous References.	Later References.
209/1929	1349 35
106/1931 Clothing for the Police Force	

S. 97. (Blue).

DOFP—1653S&P—(M-1937)—19-12-32—60,000.

CORRESPONDENCE.

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE,
CIVIL AND MILITARY STATION, BANGALORE.

No. 1321/A2 Statements encls.

Dated 21-8-1931.

FROM R. S. Milton, Esquire,

COMMISSIONER OF POLICE,

CIVIL AND MILITARY STATION,

BANGALORE.

3839-A.31

To

The Secretary to the Hon'ble
the Resident in Mysore, Bangalore.

Through

The District Magistrate,
C & M Station, Bangalore.

SIR,

Revision of pay of Police Force, C & M Station, Bangalore

S.N. 10
209-29
(J)
(Put up in connection)

I have the honour to refer to your letter No. 6644/209-1929 dated 25th August 1930 to the Political Secretary to the Government of India, Foreign and Political Department and previous connected correspondence. The revised scale of pay introduced was based on the scale in force in Madras City and it was intended that, the living expenses in Bangalore being practically on a level with those in Madras, the pay of the Bangalore Civil and Military Station Police should approximate to that in Madras. However in the final recommendations made it was not stipulated that the past services of constables should be taken into consideration to count for increments when fixing the initial pay of the men in the newly introduced time scale, and the ordinary Fundamental Rules were applied, with the result that the pay of constables ~~were~~ was left far behind that of their confreres in Madras City. The introduction of the revised scale was antedated one month in order to give the Force the benefit of the old Fundamental Rule 22.

I have gone into the matter because there is still considerable discontent among certain classes of constables

who, for instance, ignorant of Fundamental Rules, cannot understand why a Police constable with 10 years' approved service should receive the same pay as a newly joined recruit.

I find that when applying old Fundamental Rule 22 the advantages of Fundamental Rule 23 were not given to the men affected thereby, and I am advised by the Pay & Accounts Officer that the new Fundamental Rule 22 having meanwhile come into force increments cannot now be sanctioned in accordance with old Fundamental Rules 22 read with Fundamental Rules 23.

A number of Police constables of service who were, prior to the revision, on Rs. 21/- and Rs. 22/- have been seriously affected by this deprivation.

I quote below two instances to show how some of these men are affected.

Police constable 243 who has over ten years' service was, prior to revision, drawing Rs. 21/- per mensem. He was entitled to an increment in the old scale of pay on 1st September 1930. Had he availed himself of Fundamental Rule 23 he would have remained on Rs. 21/- till 1-9-1930 when he would have come into the new scale of pay on Rs. 23/- whereas under the present orders he will have to wait until 1-3-1933 to reach the salary of Rs. 23/- per month.

Police constable No. 6 who has put in 18 years' service was drawing Rs. 22/- on 28-2-30 and was entitled under the old scale to Rs. 24/- on 1-8-1930. Under the revision he was given Rs. 23/- on 1-3-30 and the Pay & Accounts Officer says that he should wait for three years (i.e. till 1-3-33) before he gets Rs. 24/-. Owing to the revision and the application of Fundamental Rules this Police Constable is actually losing money now. Had the old Fundamental Rules 22 been applied with Fundamental Rules 23 he would have remained on Rs. 22/- until 1-8-1930 on which date he would have come into the new scale on Rs. 25/-.

There are about ~~60~~ 65 men affected like this and they are very discontented.

When the revision scheme was submitted it was the intention to allow the personnel of the Force to avail of the privileges given in old Fundamental Rule$ 22 and Fundamental Rule$ 23 and the meaning of Fundamental Rule$ 23 was explained to them. The introduction of the new Fundamental Rule$ 22 as interpreted has deprived the men of the privilege given in Fundamental Rule$ 23 and the immediate benefit a number of them received viz., Re. 1/- a month for a few months, is not comparable to the loss they have sustained.

As it is essential to keep the men in the lower ranks of the Police as contented as possible, I consulted the Pay and Accounts Officer and he is of opinion that as the new Fundamental Rule$ 22 has to be applied to these men as from 18-3-30 nothing can be done. But he suggests that the Hon'ble the Resident can grant advance increments in these cases under Fundamental Rule 27.

Accordingly I submit herewith two lists: one showing the names of men who were drawing Rs. 22/- on 28-2-30 and the other showing those who were drawing Rs. 21/- on 28-2-1930 and who have been adversely affected.

In the circumstances explained above I request you kindly to obtain the sanction of the Hon'ble the Resident under Fundamental Rule 27 to grant two increments in advance to Police constables who under the old scale were drawing Rs. 22/ and one advance increment to those who were drawing Rs. 21/- from the dates mentioned against their names, which are the dates on which they would have received increments in their old scale of pay.

The extra cost that would be incurred during this year on account of this proposal (including the arrears to be paid for certain months during 1930-31) would amount to Rs. ~~744/-~~ 803/- only.

In spite of the justice of the claims of these men I would have hesitated, in a time of such financial stringency to submit these proposals but for the fact that never in my experience have I been in charge of a Police Force in which the constabulary were in such a deplorable economic condition as are the men of the Civil and Military Station Police. Every month in scores of cases deductions of pay are made in satisfaction of Civil Court Decrees and I seem to be constantly counter-signing Civil arrest warrants against my subordinates.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

COMMISSIONER OF POLICE.

L. Mis. 2839-A-31

Forwarded.

I would strongly support the recommendations made herein

D. M.

OFFICE OF THE RESIDENT IN MYSORE.
BANGALORE.
22 AUG. 1931
Rcd. 8099
No.

Sl. No.	Number	N a m e	Pay on 28-2-30	Date of next increment in the old scale.
1	20	Kumarasamy	21	1-10-1930
2	43	Anantan Nair	21	1-8-1930
3	44	Anantha Ram	21	1-6-1930
4	48	Muniswamy	21	1-11-1930
5	87	Karuppanna	21	1-1-1931
6	106	David	21	1-9-1930
7	135	Lok Singh	21	1-3-1931
8	137	Abdul Azeez	21	1-12-1930
9	171	S. Mastan	21	1-10-1930
10	182	Anthony	21	1-3-1931
11	220	S. S. Hussain	21	1-8-1930
12	223	Domanic	21	1-12-1930
13	243	S. Bavuddin	21	1-9-1930
14	254	Ahmed Sheriff	21	1-6-1931
15	263	Narainswamy	21	1-6-1931
16	285	Narasinga Rao	21	1-6-1930
17	291	Bapoo Saib	21	1-1-1931
18	294	Shama Rao	21	1-8-1930
19	321	Imam Sheriff	21	1-10-1930
20	365	Yamuddin	21	1-6-1930
21	372	Murugasan	21	1-9-1930
22	373	Shaik Khasim	21	1-12-1930
23	389	Abdul Karim	21	1-6-1930
24	406	Daniel	21	1-12-1930
25	422	Antony	21	1-4-1931
26	455	Krishnajee Rao	21	1-3-1931
27	479	Seshayya	21	1-9-1930
28	496	Dorasamy	21	1-8-1930
29	498	Hyder Khan	21	1-8-1931
30	500	Md. Zakaria	21	1-11-1930
31	512	Syed Ghouse	21	1-3-1931
32	515	Basappa	21	1-1-1931
33	519	Khader Khan	21	1-3-1931

Commissioner of Police
BANGALORE

Sl. No.	Number	N a m e	Pay on 28-2-30	Date of next increment in the old scale.
1	6	Perisamy	22	1-8-1930
2	12	Ramaswamy Nayanar	22	1-10-1932
3	24	Syed Ibrahim	22	1-10-1932
4	47	S. Ramaswamy	22	1-2-1933
5	49	Muniswamy Naidu	22	1-4-1932
6	66	Lazzar	22	1-2-1932
7	74	Rahiman Khan	22	1-12-1931
8	99	Abdul Khader	22	1-4-1931
9	100.	Ahmed Sheriff	22	1-8-1931
10	101	Abdul Karim	22	1-9-1932
11	105	Kuppuswamy	22	1-7-1932
12	107	Shaik Mahaboob	22	1-4-1932
13	130	Thangavelu	22	1-11-1930
14	206	Appadurai	22	1-7-1932
15	217	Abdul Wahab Sheriff	22	1-7-1931
16	226	Imam Saib	22	1-2-1933
17	240	Chowriappan	22	1-8-1932
18	233	Siddojee Row	22	1-6-1932
19	248	Osman Sheriff	22	1-11-1931
20	255	Narasinga Rao	22	1-5-1931
21	284	Venkat Rao	22	1-5-1931
22	287	Shaik Ahmed	22	1-2-1932
23	293	J. Rajoo	22	1-3-1932
24	296	A. Ahmid Khan	22	1-9-1931
25	304	Francis	22	1-2-1932
26	322	Sadasiva Rao	22	1-11-1930
27	335	Muniappa	22	1-4-1931
28	430	Syed Jaffar	22	1-6-1930
29	431	Syed Ibrahim	22	1-6-1932
30	462	Govinda Rao	22	1-8-1932
31	480	Syed Mahamood	22	1-4-1932
32	46	[illegible]	22	1-9-32

[illegible] Commissioner of Police

S.N 2

DEPARTMENT.

BRANCH.

File No. 554/1931

Serial No. 2

Draft ~~Letter~~ Memorandum Telegram

No. 6512 Dated 9th Sept. 1931.
Encls. 3

Class for telegrams — Ordinary / Express / Urgent* / Priority / Clear Line†

*Only for Foreign Telegrams.

†Not for Foreign Telegrams.

To be issued on | Issued on

1st Reminder

2nd Reminder

3rd Reminder

Heading:

Case or Diary No.

If post copy of telegram required

Date of despatch of above

List of enclosures

(Code word for telegrams.)

To

A copy of the marginally noted letter, with enclosures, is forwarded to the Pay and Accounts Officer, Bangalore, with the request that the Hon'ble the Resident may kindly be favoured with his views in the matter.

Secretary to the Resident.

Letter No. 1321/A., dated the 21st August, 1931, from the Commissioner of Police, Civil and Military Station, Bangalore.

S. N. 1.
P. Tn. b.

T. N. Thangavelu Mudaliar
27-8-1931.

S. 5.
MGIPC—S1—768(GI)DCF—(G-349)—11 7 29—50,000-Pads.

S N 4

4

Telegraphic Address: Bangacts, BANGALORE.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,

The Pay and Accounts Office, BANGALORE.

Telephone: Office 47

Ref. No. P.B. 3287

17th September 1931.

Enclosures

To

The Secretary to the Hon'ble the Resident in Mysore,

Bangalore.

Sir,

S.N.L

(N) With reference to your endorsement No.6512/554-1931 dated 9-9-1931, I have the honour to state that in the circumstances explained by the Commissioner, there is no objection to the Hon'ble the Resident fixing under Fundamental Rule 27, the pay of the constables referred to by the Police Commissioner at the stages proposed by him.



I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Pay and Accounts Officer.

SAB.

Ve

S W B

Proceedings of the Hon'ble the Resident in Mysore.

No. 8/02 Encl. 2 Bangalore 10 ~~Oct.~~ Nov. 1931.

Read:-

S.N.1 D

Letter No.1321/A, dated the 21st August 1931, from the Commissioner of Police, Civil & Military Station, Bangalore.

—do—

Endorsement No. Dis.3839-A-31, dated the 21st August,1931, from the District Magistrate, Civil & Military Station, Bangalore.

S.N.4 5 (G) P.W.D.

Letter No.P.B.3297, dated the 17th September,1931, & Memorandum No.P/App. 3452, dated 29-9-31 from the Pay and Accounts Officer, Bangalore.

O R D E R

S.N.4 (G)

Under Fundamental Rule 27 the Hon'ble the Resident is pleased to fix the pay of the Constables shown in the enclosed list No.I at Rs.22/- per mensem and/the Constables shown in the enclosed List No. II at Rs.24 per mensem with effect from the dates mentioned against their names, which are the dates on which they would have received increments in their old scale of pay.

2. The extra cost involved by the proposal should be met from the allotment in the current year's Assigned Tract budget under the head "Account-I - Police - A. District Executive Force - District Police - A.2-Police Forces" to which head the necessary reappropriation has been made in the enclosed statement.

Secretary to the Resident.

The

The District.Magistrate,
The Commissioner of Police,
~~The Pay and Accounts Officer~~,
~~The Audit Officer, Experiments~~,

Civil & Military Station,
Bangalore.

The Accountant-general
Madras.

T. N. Thangavelu
Mudaliar

17-10-1931.

Rec'd
completed 7/11

C. A. C. 25.

Bangalore Civil & Military Station Budget for 1931-32.

Form of statement to accompany all applications for sanction to expenditure not provided for in Budget.

Expenditure proposed to be provided for :—

Rs. 1,350/-

of (a) advance increments sanctioned to Police Force.

Account I - Police A-District Executive Force-District Police -A.2-Police Force. on account

} Major head. } Minor head. } Sub head. } Detailed head.

Amount proposed to be spent during current year — Rs.
Amount proposed to be spent during future years — Rs.

Proposed re-appropriation for current year.

1 Heads of estimate affected by the proposal. (b)	2 Actual expenditure up to date of the proposal (*viz.*,).	3 Amounts as in the estimate passed by Government.	4 Amounts as they will stand after re-appropriation.
Non-Voted. † (1) Heads under which the proposed expenditure will fall.	R	R	R
Account I - Police - A-District Executive Force - District Police - A.2-Police Force.		1,70,600	1,71,950
TOTAL		1,70,600	1,71,950
Non-Voted. † (2) Heads under which it is proposed to reduce the grants.			
Account I - Police - A. District Executive Force - District Police A-4-Allowances, Honoraria etc.		20,400 -540 19,860	18,510
TOTAL		19,860	18,510

(a) Here enter full description, mentioning the grant, primary unit of appropriation and the Department, or office, or Officer concerned.
(b) The same detail must be shown as in the printed estimates of the Government (or the sanctioned estimate), as the re-appropriation has to be effected by transfer of the figures shown therein.

NOTE 1.—Any further explanations should be given on reverse, where also, if no re-appropriation is possible, the urgency and necessity for the expenditure should be fully explained.

NOTE 2.—When the application is submitted for the sanction of a Local Government, the form may be modified in any way the Local Government thinks fit, provided that the Local Government indicates distinctly in the order issued that the new expenditure is to be met by re-appropriation from anticipated savings under the same or another major head under the same grant.

NOTE 3.—The estimates referred to are the Budget and not the Revised estimates. The Revised estimates must never be referred to in this application.

No 8108 †NOTE 4.—When the figures of more than one grant are involved, the names of the grant should be noted in manuscript above the major heads.

Sanctioned under Rule 67 of the Book of Financial Powers.

Station Bangalore, (*Signature*)

Date 10th November 1931.

(*Designation*)

for Secretary to the Govt

WB P

DCFP—1176Audit—(G-1328)—12-5-31—10,000.

The District Magistrate,
The Commissioner of Police,
Civil & Military Station
The Accountant General,
Madras.

BJ

List No. I.

Sl. No.	Number.	Name.	Pay on 28-2-30.	Pay now fixed under F.R. 27.		Remarks.
				Pay.	Date from which the revised pay should be drawn	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
			Rs.	Rs.		
1.	20	Kumarasamy	21	22	1-10-1930.	
2.	43	Anantan Nair.	21	22	1-8-1930.	
3.	44	Anantha Ram.	21	22	1-6-1930.	
4.	48	Muniswamy.	21	22	1-11-1930	
5.	87	Karuppanna.	21	22	1-1-1931.	
6.	106	David.	21	22	1-9-1930.	
7.	135	Lok Singh.	21	22	1-3-1931.	
8.	137	Abdul Azeez.	21	22	1-12-1930.	
9.	171	S. Mastan.	21	22	1-10-1930.	
10.	182	Anthony	21	22	1-3-1931.	
11.	220	S.S.Hussain.	21	22	1-8-1930.	
12.	223	Domanic	21	22	1-12-1930.	
13.	243	S. Davuddin.	21	22	1-9-1930.	
14.	254	Ahmed Sheriff.	21	22	1-6-1931.	
15.	263	Narainswamy	21	22	1-6-1931.	
16.	285	Narasinga Rao.	21	22	1-6-1930.	
17.	291	Bapoo Saib.	21	22	1-1-1931.	
18.	294	Shama Rao	21	22	1-8-1930.	
19.	321	Imam Sheriff.	21	22	1-10-1930.	
20.	365	Yamuddin.	21	22	1-6-1930.	
21.	372	Murugasan.	21	22	1-9-1930.	
22.	373	Shaik Khasim.	21	22	1-12-1930.	
23.	389	Abdul Karim.	21	22	1-6-1930.	
24.	406	Daniel.	21	22	1-12-1930.	
25.	422	Antony	21	22	1-4-1931.	
26.	455	Krishnajee Rao.	21	22	1-3-1931.	
27.	470	Seshayya	21	22	1-9-~~1930~~ 1930	
28.	496	Dorasamy.	21	22	1-8-1930.	
29.	498	Hyder Khan.	21	22	1-8-1931.	
30.	500	Md. Zakaria.	21	22	1-11-1930.	
31.	512	Syed Ghouse.	21	22	1-3-1931.	
32.	515	Basappa.	21	22	1-1-1931.	
33.	519	Khader Khan.	21	22	1-3-1931.	

Sl. No.	Number.	Name.	Pay on 23-2-30.	Pay now fixed under F.R.27. Pay.	Pay now fixed under F.R.27. Date from which the revised pay should be drawn.	Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	6	Perisamy	22	24	1-8-1930.	
2	12	RamaswamyNayanar	22	24	1-10-1932.	
3	24	Syed Ibrahim	22	24	1-10-1932.	
4.	47	S. Ramaswamy	22	24	1-2-1933.	
5.	49	Muniswamy Naidu	22	24	1-4-1932.	
6.	66	Lazzar	22	24	1-2-1932.	
7.	74	Rahiman Khan.	22	24	1-12-1931.	
8.	99	Abdul Khader.	22	24	1-4-1931.	
9.	100	Ahmed Sheriff	22	24	1-8-1931.	
10.	101	Abdul Karim.	22	24	1-9-1932.	
11.	105	Kuppuswamy.	22	24	1-7-1932.	
12.	107	Shaik Mahaboob	22	24	1-4-1932.	
13.	130	Thangavelu	22	24	1-11-1930.	
14.	206	Appadurai	22	24	1-7-1932.	
15.	217	Abdul Wahab Sheriff	22	24	1-7-1931.	
16.	226	Imam Saib.	22	24	1-2-1933.	
17.	240	Chowriappan.	22	24	1-8-1932.	
18.	233	Siddojee Row	22	24	1-6-1932.	
19.	248	Osman Sheriff.	22	24	1-11-1931.	
20.	255	Narasinga Rao.	22	24	1-5-1931.	
21.	284	Venkat Rao.	22	24	1-5-1931.	
22.	287	Shaik Ahmed.	22	24	1-2-1932.	
23.	293	J. Rajoo	22	24	1-3-1932.	
24.	296	A. Ahmid Khan.	22	24	1-9-1931.	
25.	304	Francis.	22	24	1-2-1932.	
26.	322	Sadasiva Rao.	22	24	1-11-1930.	
27.	335	Muniappa.	22	24	1-4-1931.	
28.	430	Syed Jaffar.	22	24	1-6-1930.	
29.	431	Syed Ibrahim.	22	24	1-6-1932.	
30.	462	Govinda Rao.	22	24	1-8-1932.	
31.	480	Syed Mahamood.	22	24	1-4-1932.	
32.	76	Ethirajulu	22	24	1-9-1932.	

BJ

S N·7 7

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE,
CIVIL AND MILITARY STATION, BANGALORE.

No. 1321/A/31 en2 Dated 16-11-1931

FROM E. H. Sullivan, Esquire,

COMMISSIONER OF POLICE,
CIVIL AND MILITARY STATION,
BANGALORE.

To

The Secretary to the Hon'ble the
Resident in Mysore, Bangalore.



SIR,

With reference to your endorsement No. 8102 conveying sanction of the Hon'ble the Resident to grant advance increments to certain constables in the Force, I have the honour to point out that the lists forwarded as enclosures to the Proceedings referred to above do not satisfy the requirements.

S.N.6 of Collection at Sl. No. D

S.N.1 of Collection at Sl. No. I

Mr. Milton in his letter No. 1321/A/31 dated 21-8-1931 recommended that the pay of the constables named in the 1st list should be fixed at Rs. 23/- and those in the 2nd list at Rs. 25/- from the dates noted against their names and therefore requested sanction under F. R. 27 to grant one advance increment to constables who were drawing Rs. 21/- before revision and two advance increments to those who were drawing Rs. 22/- before revision. This is the pay which they would have got if old F. R. 22 had been applied after they got increments in the old scale on the dates noted against their names and this legitimate benefit they have been deprived of by the amended F. R. 22. To save them therefore from pecuniary loss and to differentiate a man with years of service from a new recruit who both got the same pay i.e., Rs. 22/- (the minimum pay of a constable) after the revision on 1-3-1930, was the intention of Mr.

Milton's letter with which I entirely agree.

Men shown in list No. 1 sent to me as enclosure to your number referred to above must therefore be given Rs. 23/- each and those shown in list No. 2 Rs. 25/- each from the dates noted against their names.

I therefore forward herewith 2 lists ~~as they ought to be~~ corrected for favour of the Hon'ble the Resident's approval and request that the proceedings now communicated may be modified accordingly.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

15/11/31

COMMISSIONER OF POLICE.

List No. I

Sl. No.	Number	Name	Pay on 28-2-30	Pay since 1-3-30.	Pay to be fixed under F. R.27.	
					Pay	Date from which the revised pay should be drawn
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	20	Kumarasamy	21	22	23	1-10-1930
2	43	Anantan Nair	21	22	23	1-8-1930
3	44	Anantha Ram	21	22	23	1-6-1930
4	48	Muniswamy	21	22	23	1-11-1930
5	87	Karupanna	21	22	23	1-1-1931
6	106	David	21	22	23	1-9-1930
7	135	Lok Singh	21	22	23	1-3-1931
8	137	Abdul Azeez	21	22	23	1-12-1930
9	171	S. Mastan	21	22	23	1-10-1930
10	182	Anthony	21	22	23	1-3-1931
11	220	S.S. Hussain	21	22	23	1-8-1930
12	223	Domanic	21	22	23	1-12-1930
13	243	S. Bavuddin	21	22	23	1-9-1930
14	254	Ahmed Sheriff	21	22	23	1-6-1931
15	263	Narainswamy	21	22	23	1-6-1931
16	285	Narasinga Rao	21	22	23	1-6-1930
17	291	Bapoo Saib	21	22	23	1-1-1931
18	294	Shama Rao	21	22	23	1-8-1930
19	321	Imam Sheriff	21	22	23	1-10-1930
20	365	Yamuddin	21	22	23	1-6-1930
21	372	Murugasan	21	22	23	1-9-1930
22	373	Shaik Khasim	21	22	23	1-12-1930
23	389	Abdul Karim	21	22	23	1-6-1930
24	406	Daniel	21	22	23	1-12-1930
25	422	Antony	21	22	23	1-4-1931
26	455	Krishnajee Rao	21	22	23	1-3-1931
27	479	Seshayya	21	22	23	1-9-1930
28	496	Dorasamy	21	22	23	1-8-1930
29	498	Hyder Khan	21	22	23	1-8-1931
30	500	Md. Zakaria	21	22	23	1-11-1930
31	512	Syed Ghouse	21	22	23	1-3-1931
32	515	Basappa	21	22	23	1-1-1931
33	519	Khader Khan	21	22	23	1-3-1931

15.11.31

COMMISSIONER OF POLICE.

7/B

List No. II.

Sl. No.	Number	Name	Pay on 28-2-30	Pay since 1-3-30.	Pay to be fixed under F. R.27.	
					Pay	Date from which the revised pay should be drawn
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	6	Perisamy	22	23	25	1-8-1930
2	12	Ramaswamy Nayanayar	22	23	25	1-10-1932
3	24	Syed Ibrahim	22	23	25	1-10-1932
4	47	S. Ramaswamy	22	23	25	1-2-1933
5	49	Muniswamy Naidu	22	23	25	1-4-1932
6	66	Lazzar	22	23	25	1-2-1932
7	74	Rahiman Khan	22	23	25	1-12-1931
8	99	Abdul Khader	22	23	25	1-4-1931
9	100.	Ahmed Sheriff	22	23	25	1-8-1931
10	101	Abdul Karim	22	23	25	1-9-1932
11	105	Kuppusamy	22	23	25	1-7-1932
12	107	Shaik Mahaboob	22	23	25	1-4-1932
13	130	Thangavelu	22	23	25	1-11-1930
14	206	Appadurai	22	23	25	1-7-1932
15	217	Abdul Wahab Sheriff	22	23	25	1-7-1931
16	226	Imam Saib	22	23	25	1-2-1933
17	240	Chowriappan	22	23	25	1-8-1932
18	233	Siddojee Row	22	23	25	1-6-1932
19	248	Osman Sheriff	22	23	25	1-11-1931
20	255	Narasinga Rao	22	23	25	1-5-1931
21	284	Venkat Rao	22	23	25	1-5-1931
22	287	Shaik Ahmed	22	23	25	1-2-1932
23	293	J. Rajoo	22	23	25	1-3-1932
24	296	A. Ahmid Khan	22	23	25	1-9-1931
25	304	Francis	22	23	25	1-2-1932
26	322	Sadasiva Rao	22	23	25	1-11-1930
27	335	Muniappa	22	23	25	1-4-1931
28	430	Syed Jaffar	22	23	25	1-6-1930
29	431	Syed Ibrahim	22	23	25	1-6-1932
30	462	Govinda Rao	22	23	25	1-8-1932
31	480	Syed Mahamood	22	23	25	1-4-1932
32	76	Ethirajulu	22	23	25	1-9-1932.

15.11.31

COMMISSIONER OF POLICE.

To be substituted for the proceedings of the same number and date.

DEPARTMENT. File No.

BRANCH. Serial No.

Draft Letter / ~~Memorandum~~ / Telegram

Class for telegrams: Ordinary / Express / Urgent* / Priority / Clear Line† — *Only for Foreign Telegrams. †Not for Foreign Telegrams.

To be issued on	Issued on
1st Reminder	
2nd Reminder	S.N.1 of Collection No.1 at Sl.No.1
3rd Reminder	& S.N.7. P.C. ?
Heading:	
Case or Diary No.	
If post copy of telegram required	
Date of despatch of above	S.N.1 of Collection No.1 at Sl.No.1
List of enclosures	

(~~Code word for telegrams.~~)

S.N.4.5 of Collection No.1 at Sl.No.1

S.N.7/A. Encls to P.C.?

S.N.7/B. Encls to P.C.?

No. 8102 Dated 10th November 19 31.

Proceedings of the Hon'ble the ------- Resident in Mysore.

To ---------

Read:-

Letter No. 1321-A/31, dated the 21st August and 16th November, 1931, from the Commissioner of Police, Civil and Military Station, Bangalore.

Endorsement No. Dis. 3839-A-31, dated the 21st August, 1931, from the District Magistrate, Civil and Military Station, Bangalore.

Letter No. P.B. 3297, dated the 17th September, 1931 and Memorandum --- No. P/App. 3452, dated 29th September, 1931, from the Pay and Accounts Officer, Bangalore.

Order.

Under Fundamental Rule 27 the --- Hon'ble the Resident is pleased to fix the pay of the Constables shown in the enclosed list No. I at Rs. 23/- per mensem and of the Constables shown in the enclosed List No. II at Rs. 25/- per mensem, with effect from the dates mentioned against their names, which are the dates on which they would have ----- received increments in their old scale of pay.

S 5.

M&IPC—S1—325 (GBS) DOF—(G-1432)—24-4-31—50,000 Pads.

2. The extra cost involved by the proposal should be met from the -------- allotment in the current year's Assigned Tract budget under the head "Account I-Police-A-District Executive Force-District Police-A.2-Police Forces" to which head the necessary reappropriation has been made in the enclosed statement.

Secretary to the Resident

To

The District Magistrate, Civil and Military Station, Bangalore.

The Commissioner of Police, Civil and Military Station, Bangalore.

The Accountant General, Madras.

T. N. T. Rangavalu
Mudaliar
21-11-1931

Bangalore & Adm. Station Budget for 1931–32

C. A[illegible]. 25.

Form of statement to accompany all applications for sanction to expenditure not provided for in Budget.

Expenditure proposed to be provided for :— Account I – Police
Rs. 1350/- A. Dist. Executive Force – Dist. Police } Major head.
of (a) advance increments sanctioned A–2 – Police Force. } Minor head.
to Police Force. on account } Sub head. } Detailed head.

Amount proposed to be spent during current year . Rs.
Amount proposed to be spent during future years . Rs.

Proposed re-appropriation for current year.

Heads of estimate affected by the proposal. (b)	2 Actual expenditure up to date of the proposal (*viz.*,).	3 Amounts as in the estimate passed by Government.	4 Amounts as they will stand after re-appropriation.
Non-Voted	R	R	R
†(1) Heads under which the proposed expenditure will fall.			
Account I – Police –			
A – Dist: Executive Force –			
Dist: Police –			
A – 2 – Police Force.		1,70,600	1,71,950 +12
TOTAL		1,70,600	1,71,950
Non-Voted			
†(2) Heads under which it is proposed to reduce the grants.			
Account I – Police –		20400	
A – Dist: Executive Force –		– 540	
Dist: Police –			
A – 6 – Allowances			
Honoraria etc		=19,860	18,510
TOTAL		19,860	18,510

(a) Here enter full description, mentioning the grant, primary unit of appropriation and the Department, or office, or Officer concerned.
(b) The same detail must be shown as in the printed estimates of the Government (or the sanctioned estimate), as the re-appropriation has to be effected by transfer of the figures shown therein.
NOTE 1.—Any further explanations should be given on reverse, where also, if no re-appropriation is possible, the urgency and necessity for the expenditure should be fully explained.
NOTE 2.—When the application is submitted for the sanction of a Local Government, the form may be modified in any way the Local Government thinks fit, provided that the Local Government indicates distinctly in the order issued that the new expenditure is to be met by re-appropriation from anticipated savings under the same or another major head under the same grant.
NOTE 3.—The estimates referred to are the Budget and not the Revised estimates. The Revised estimates must never be referred to in this application.
†NOTE 4.—When the figures of more than one grant are involved, the names of the grant should be noted in manuscript above the major heads.

Sanctioned under Rule 67 of the Book of Financial Powers

Station *(Signature)*

Date 10 – 11 – 1931. *(Designation)* Secretary to the Resident

DOFP—1176Audit—(G-1328)—12-5-31—10,000.

T. N. Thangavelu Mudaliar.

S N·4 7

Telegraphic Address: Bangacts, BANGALORE.	GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, **The Pay and Accounts Office, BANGALORE.**	Telephone: Office 47

Ref. No.P.B.3386

Enclosures

OFFICE OF THE RESIDENT IN MYSORE.
BANGALORE.
23 SEPT. 1931
Rec'd. 9224
554/31

24th September 1931

To

The Secretary to the Hon'ble the Resident in Mysore,

Bangalore.

Sir,

S.N.24 209-29 (M)

I have the honour to invite a reference to your letter No.3713/209-1929, dated 22-5-1931, regarding the fixation of pay of Mr. S.L. Vinayaga Mudaliar, Confidential Assistant to the Commissioner of Police, and to state that the Audit Officer, Bangalore has remarked that "the grant of next stage of pay on 1-4-1930 does not seem to be in order as there is no indication that there was any change in the duties of the personal clerk owing to the change of designation and increased pay. The proposals for revision only referred to the fact that the old rate of pay Rs.55-110 was not sufficient and that it was to be assimilated to the Sub-Inspector's post with a special pay of Rs.20/- per mensem."

It appeared to me from para 29 - Personal Clerk, of the Hon'ble the Resident's letter to the Government of India No. ~~8554~~ 8485, dated 7-10-1929, that the new post of Confidential Assistant involved the assumption of greater duties or responsibilities than those attached to the post of the old Personal Clerk. Please see specially the second sentence of that paragraph. The declaration issued with your No.3713/209-1929 dated 22-5-1931 was intended to make this clear for purposes of audit.

S.N.2 209-29 (L)

S.N.24 209-29 (M)

The Audit Officer, Bangalore who was requested to reconsider his views has observed that "the paragraph in the Hon'ble the Resident's letter, referred to, contains only a justification for the increase in the pay of the post of the personal Clerk which was stated to be more onerous and responsible than even that of a Sub-Inspector in the ordinary line and there is nothing to show that a change in the designation of the post to 'Confidential Assistant' involved the assumption of duties and responsibilities of greater importance."

It may however be pointed out that the old Personal Clerk had not the responsibilities of a Sub-Inspector and when, at the end of the present tenure, he ceases to hold the post of Confidential Assistant, he would normally revert not as clerk but as Sub-Inspector. I also took it that as Confidential Assistant, the Commissioner would be prepared to give him more responsible work than he did to the old Personal Clerk.

If you agree, the term "a clerk" used in the declaration made in your letter No.3713/209-1929 dated 27-5-31 may be corrected to "the personal clerk".

S.N.24
209-29
(M)

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

SAB.

Pay and Accounts Officer.

S IV 10

DEPARTMENT.

BRANCH.

File No. 554

Serial No. 31

Draft ~~Letter~~ Memorandum ~~Telegram~~

Class for telegrams | Ordinary | Express | ~~Urgent*~~ | ~~Priority~~ | Clear Line† | *Only for Foreign Telegrams. †Not for Foreign Telegrams.

No. 7821 Dated 29th October 1931

To

To be issued on | Issued on

1st Reminder

2nd Reminder

3rd Reminder

Heading; S. N. 24 209-29

Case or Diary No. (M)

If post copy of telegram required

Date of despatch of above

List of enclosures

(Code word for telegrams.)

Erratum.

In letter No. 3713, dated the 22nd May, 1931, from this Residency for the words "a clerk" substitute "the personal clerk"

27/10

Secretary to the Resident.

To

The Pay and Accounts Officer, Bangalore, with reference to his ---- letter No. P.B. 3386, dated the 24th September, 1931.

S. N. 7 P. W. R

The Commissioner of Police, Civil and Military Station, Bangalore.

T. N. Thangavelu Mudaliar 016-10-1931

S. N. 28/X

S. N. 2/11

S. O.

MG|PC—S1—325 (CPS) DCF—(G-1&2)—24-4-31—50,000 Pads.